

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The non-final Office Action dated January 8, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicant has amended the specification and claims 3, 5, 7, and 19. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-28 are pending with claims 6, 8, and 21-28 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections are requested based upon the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to because of informalities in paragraphs [0021] and [0017]. Applicant has amended these paragraphs for clarity. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, on page 11, paragraph [0052] and page 13, [0056]. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, the objection is overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 10, 11 and 20 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant believes the Examiner has misinterpreted claim 1. As illustrated in FIG. 2C of the present application, dielectric frame 67 is formed. Subsequently, as shown in FIG. 2D, a sealant 69 is formed (Specification, page 10, [0050]). Applicant submits the first and second gaps referenced by the Office Action in paragraph [0051] of the Specification pertain to the distribution of the liquid crystal. One of ordinary skill in the art would be familiar with methods to dispense the liquid crystal on the first substrate. Further, on page 11, [0052], support is provided for the height of the sealant. Specifically, "the thickness of the sealant 69 is controlled to sufficiently obtain a step difference between the sealant 69 and the dielectric frame 67. The suitable step difference between the sealant 69 and the dielectric frame allows adequate movement of the liquid crystal in the liquid crystal layer" (see, Specification, page 11, [0052]). Table I is provided to show the overall "relationship between the height of the sealant and the height of the dielectric frame" to facilitate movement of the liquid crystal in the liquid crystal layer. Applicant further submits there is nothing in the specification to dictate that Table I contains only the "after-mated" relationship, as suggested in the Office Action. Applicant has amended [0053] for clarity. Based upon the above discussion and the amendments to [0053], Applicant respectfully submits the objection to claims 1, 10, 11 and 20 is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The Office Action objected to claims 3, 5 and 19 because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 3, 5 and 19 to clarify the recited subject matter. Accordingly, the objections are overcome. Withdrawal of the objections are requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claim 7 to clarify that the TFT may have a “L” shaped channel. Based upon this amendment, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7.

In the Office Action claims 1, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,130,729, issued to Oh et al. (hereafter “Oh”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,965, issued to Liu et al. (hereafter “Liu”) and U. S. Patent No. 6,055,035, issued to Von Gutfeld, et al. (hereafter “Von Gutfeld”). Dependent claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh, Liu and Von Gutfeld in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,515,718, issued to Kishimoto et al. (hereafter “Kishimoto”). Dependent claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh, Liu, and Von Gutfeld in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,528, issued to Tanaka et al. (hereafter “Tanaka”). And, dependent claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh, Liu, and Von Gutfeld in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,953, issued to Kim et al. (hereafter “Kim”).

Applicant traverses the rejections because the various combinations of references noted above and provided in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest the combined features recited in the claims of the present invention. In particular, neither Oh, Liu, Von Gutfeld, Kishimoto, Tanaka, nor Kim, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests a method of forming a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “forming a dielectric frame having a first height and a sealant having a second height on a second substrate, the first height of the dielectric frame being different from the second height of the sealant” and “dispensing liquid crystal on the first substrate”, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Because none of the references, singly or combined, teaches or describes at least these features recited in claim 1 of the present invention, claim 1 and its rejected dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9-15 and 17-20 are allowable over the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested

Application No.: 10/015,701
Amendment dated April 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated January 8, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.479.00-US

to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202)496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant